

1997-98 SESSION  
COMMITTEE HEARING  
RECORDS

Committee Name:

Joint Committee on  
Finance (JC-Fi)

Sample:

Record of Comm. Proceedings ... RCP

- 05hrAC-EdR\_RCP\_pt01a
- 05hrAC-EdR\_RCP\_pt01b
- 05hrAC-EdR\_RCP\_pt02

➤ Appointments ... Appt

➤ \*\*

➤ Clearinghouse Rules ... CRule

➤ \*\*

➤ Committee Hearings ... CH

➤ \*\*

➤ Committee Reports ... CR

➤ \*\*

➤ Executive Sessions ... ES

➤ \*\*

➤ Hearing Records ... HR

➤ \*\*

➤ Miscellaneous ... Misc

➤ 97hrJC-Fi\_Misc\_pt42c\_LFB

➤ Record of Comm. Proceedings ... RCP

➤ \*\*

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### **Percent-for-Art Program (Building Program)**

[LFB Summary: Page 98.13, #20]

## CURRENT LAW

Under the percent-for-art program, at least two-tenths of one percent of the cost of new state building projects exceeding \$250,000 must be used to purchase original works of art to be incorporated into the structure of the building project or for display in or around the project and to pay for the program's administrative costs. The statutes define "work of art" as any original creation of visual art, and specify that a work of art does not include any decorative, ornamental, functional or landscape element of a state building, unless an artist is specifically commissioned to create such an element.

After an architect is selected for a project, the Arts Board is required to convene an advisory committee to review and recommend works of art to be incorporated into the structure. The advisory committee must consist of at least five members including: (a) one member of the Board; (b) at least two persons who are arts professionals; and (c) at least two persons who are project managers, architects, users of the building or members of the Building Commission. After reviewing the recommendations of the advisory committee, the Board makes the final selection of the artist and the work of art. The Board is required to ensure that a work of art is maintained and displayed for at least 25 years, unless the Board finds that earlier removal is in the public interest. If it is determined that the work of art should be removed, the Board is required to loan the work of art to an accredited museum in the state or to an educational or other appropriate public institution capable of maintaining and exhibiting the work of art.

## **BUILDING COMMISSION**

The Building Commission recommended a number of changes to the percent-for-art program. This paper focuses on three of those recommendations, which are summarized as sections d., e., and g. under entry #20 in the LFB summary of the building program. These items follow:

1. Specify that "work of art" may include any distinctive architectural features containing artistic value;
2. Allow the Arts Board, prior to convening an advisory committee to review and recommend works of art, to select the artist for a project in coordination with selection of the architect if the work of art will be incorporated into the design of the project and the total cost of the project is \$10,000,000 or more; and
3. Change the number of advisory committee members from at least five members to not more than seven members and require that the advisory committee include at least one person who is a resident of the area in which the work of art will be located, to represent the interests of the public in that area.

## **DISCUSSION POINTS**

### **Definition of Work of Art**

1. Current law specifically excludes from the definition of "work of art," any decorative, ornamental, functional or landscape element of a state building, unless an artist is specifically commissioned to create such an element. The Commission's proposal would retain this exclusion but would change the definition to include any distinctive architectural features containing artistic value. DFD staff indicate that this change is intended to encourage the integration of the art work into the design of the building. As an example of the type of architectural feature which could be used as the art work, DFD staff cite a decorative plaza outside of a UW-Madison building which was funded through the percent-for-art program. Since such architectural features have been considered as eligible works of art in the past, one could argue that the proposed modification is unnecessary.

2. Opponents of the definition change argue that it could permit percent-for-art funds to be used for architectural elements which otherwise would have been included in the design of the building. In addition, concerns have been raised that the architect could also be designated as the artist. However, DFD staff indicate that it is not the intent of the provision to allow the work of art to be created by an architect. In addition, it is unlikely that this would occur, since the Board would still be responsible for the selection of the artist. However, to clarify this point,

the Committee may wish to specify that the artist selected for a project could not also be an architect assigned to the project.

### **Selection of Artist**

3. Under the percent-for-art program, the artist and work of art are recommended by an advisory committee, with the final selection made by the Arts Board. The statutes specify that the committee be convened after selection of the architect. Under the proposed modification, the Board would be permitted to bypass the advisory committee in the selection of an artist for a building project costing \$10 million or more, if the work of art is to be incorporated into the design of the building.

4. Staff from the Division of Facilities Development (DFD) within the Department of Administration indicate that the proposed change is intended to allow the artist to be selected earlier in the process in order to facilitate coordination between the architect and the artist so that the work of art may be incorporated into the design of the project rather than added to the project after it has been completed. Because an artist's fee would be higher for such a project due to the time commitment and level of collaboration involved, the provision would only apply to projects with a percent-for-art budget of at least \$20,000. In support of the proposal, DFD staff cite instances in which certain buildings did not have the structural capability to support the works of art which were created for them. In addition, it has been argued that the art work for some projects appears to have been "added on" to the building, rather than incorporated into it.

5. The process of convening an advisory committee and selecting an artist and a work of art can take nine to 12 months, depending on the size and scope of the project. According to Arts Board staff, the percent-for-art program currently has a backlog of over 100 projects, which is primarily due to staffing limitations and the length of time required to select a work of art. For these reasons, it is often the case that the artist is not selected until after the design of the building has been completed and construction has begun. In addition, Arts Board staff indicate that the Board is not usually notified of an eligible building project until after the architect has been selected.

6. In April of 1997, the Arts Board approved a proposal under which the artist would become involved in a project beginning with the preliminary design stages, for projects costing \$15 million or more. To hasten the selection of an artist, the Board would convene an advisory committee to select a pool of pre-screened artists whose work would be appropriate for integration into a building and who are interested in working collaboratively with an architect throughout the project. The Board's proposal appears to be similar to the Building Commission's recommendation except that it would apply to building projects costing at least \$15 million, rather than \$10 million and the advisory committee, rather than the Board, would select the artist. Given that the Board has proposed these program modifications be accomplished under current law, one could argue that the recommended statutory change is unnecessary.

7. Current law requires that the 15 members of the Arts Board, who are appointed by the Governor, be state residents who are known for their concern for the arts. One could argue that the advisory committee, which would include at least two persons involved in the design, construction and/or use of the building, would be better suited to selecting the artist whose work would be incorporated into the building. The proposed bill provision could be modified to remove the current requirement that the advisory committee be convened after selection of the architect. This would permit an advisory committee to establish a pool of pre-approved artists who could be considered for such collaborative projects. The Board would retain the authority to make the final selection of the artist, but would be able to do so in a shorter period of time.

### **Number of Advisory Committee Members**

8. There is currently a minimum, but no maximum, number of members which can be appointed to an advisory committee. The proposed modification would change the required number of members from at least five, to not more than seven members and would add the requirement that a committee include at least one member be a resident of the community in which the art would be located. Arts Board staff indicate that in the past, advisory committees have consisted of five to 15 members, depending on the size of the project. The larger committees have generally been convened for particularly large projects, projects which involve more than one state agency, or when one committee is convened for two contiguous projects.

9. Board staff argue that limiting the number of members to seven would not allow for sufficient representation of building users and persons involved in the project. DFD staff, however, argue that larger committees are unwieldy and difficult to coordinate due to scheduling conflicts among the various members. An option which would limit the number of members while allowing some flexibility for particularly large, or combined projects, would be to specify that a committee could consist of not more than nine members.

## **ALTERNATIVES TO BASE**

### **A. Definition of Work of Art**

1. Approve the Building Commission's recommendation that "work of art" may include any distinctive architectural features containing artistic value.

2. Modify the Building Commission's recommendation to specify that the artist selected for a project could not be an architect assigned to the project.

3. Maintain current law.

**B. Selection of Artist**

1. Approve the Building Commission's recommendation to allow the Arts Board to select the artist for a project prior to convening an advisory committee if the total cost of the project is \$10 million or more and the art will be incorporated into the design of the building.
2. Modify the Building Commission's recommendation to also delete the current law requirement that an advisory committee be convened after selection of the architect and provide that the Board could convene an advisory committee to recommend a pool of artists whose work would be appropriate for integration into a building and who would be willing to work collaboratively with an architect.
3. Maintain current law.

**C. Number of Advisory Committee Members**

1. Approve the Building Commission's recommendation to change the number of advisory committee members from at least five members to not more than seven members.
2. Modify the Building Commission's recommendation to provide that an advisory committee could consist of not more than nine members.
3. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: Merry Larsen

MO# AIH#A2#B2

2 JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

MO# AIH#C1

2 JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 12 NO 4 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### State Fair Park Capital Budget (Building Program)

[LFB Summary: Page 98.1, 98.2 and 98.3 #1 and Page 98.12 #18]

## CURRENT LAW

State Fair Park Board is provided \$13.0 million in general fund supported bonding for the construction of housing facilities at State Fair Park and \$27.85 million in self amortizing general obligation bonding to construct or improve facilities at the Park. To date, \$11 million in GPR supported bonding and \$20.55 million in PR supported bonding have been authorized for release by the Building Commission.

## BUILDING COMMISSION

Delete \$755,500 in general fund supported bonding by: (a) deleting \$2.0 million GPR supported bonding associated with the construction of a dormitory facility at the Park; and (b) providing \$1,244,500 GPR supported bonding to upgrade and replace main services (sewer, water, storm sewer and electrical services) to Park buildings.

Further, provide \$4,292,500 in self amortizing general obligation bonding as follows: (a) \$1,244,500 PR supported bonding to upgrade and replace main services to Park buildings; and (b) \$3,048,000 PR supported bonding for additional racetrack improvements at the Park.

## **DISCUSSION POINTS**

### **Program Revenue and Capital Improvement Account**

1. Any surplus revenue from State Fair Park activities, and lease payments from the race track contractor (Haas Racing Team) and the for the Pettit National Ice Center after operation costs are paid, is transferred to the Park Board capital improvements continuing appropriation account. Any reduction in revenues or increases in debt service or other operating costs effectively reduces the amount of funds that are available for capital improvements.
2. Historically, the capital improvement fund has been used to finance renovation and repair projects related to the existing facility. However, the balance in the fund has declined from \$3.0 million in 1990-91 to approximately \$200,000 available currently. With such a limited balance the capital improvement fund is likely to have difficulty funding even small projects or meeting the immediate needs of the Park.
3. In January, 1997, the State Building Commission approved the use of \$1.0 million in funding from the Park Board's capital improvement fund for utility improvements and repairs related to the dormitory facility. Prior to the Building Commission action to transfer funds, the Park's capital improvement fund had a balance of \$1.2 million. In approving the transfer of funds, the Commission indicated that the Park Board had to repay the funds with interest from gifts and grants donations to the Park. When the dormitory facility was approved by the Legislature in 1995, Park Board officials indicated that approximately \$5.0 million in gifts and grants would be raised to offset the costs of the facility. To date, only minimal gifts and grants have been received.
4. DOA officials indicated that State Fair Park originally requested the \$1.0 million that was borrowed from the capital improvement account for the dormitory facility from their \$5.0 million in gifts and grants. The Commission determined that the Park Board did not have the needed gifts and grants to assist in funding the project. Despite having \$2.0 million in general fund supported borrowing available, the Commission decided to borrow from the Park's capital improvement fund. DOA indicated that it was decided that borrowing from the Park's capital improvement fund rather than using the available GPR supported bonding may encourage Park officials to generate a portion of the \$5.0 million in gifts and grants funds they indicated could be realized when the dormitory project was authorized. In a related action, in May, 1997, the Building Commission released \$550,000 of PR supported bonding to construct office space at the dormitory facility.
5. A March, 1996, Legislative Audit Bureau report indicated that the State Fair Park's ability to finance additional program revenue debt was limited because the availability of sufficient revenues is questionable. The audit indicated that it would be particularly difficult to finance any major construction or major renovation projects from Park revenues.



6. The proposed 1997-99 building program would provide the Park an additional \$2,489,000 in bonding: \$1,244,500 GPR supported bonding and \$1,244,500 PR supported bonding to upgrade and replace main services (sewer, water, storm sewer and electrical services) to Park buildings. State Fair Park had requested all \$2,489,000 GPR supported bonding borrowing (GPR debt service costs) for the improvements at the Park. DOA and the Governor have also indicated that the general fund supported borrowing is needed. However, they indicate that a 50/50 split between program revenue supported and general fund supported borrowing would establish a compromise position in which the state provides some assistance in repairing and upgrading the Park while requiring the Park to make an investment in its infrastructure.

7. Prior to the authorizing of \$13.0 million GPR supported bonding for the dormitory facility, State Fair Park had been a self sufficient program revenue supported entity. While the general fund supported borrowing built a dormitory facility which was needed to safely house the state's youth during the State Fair, the current proposal would provide general fund supported borrowing for general improvements at the Park. Park officials and DOA indicate that the improvements are needed to address safety issues and lessen the risk of events being disrupted at the Park.

8. Given the concerns over the likelihood that the Park would be able to fund the additional program revenue supported debt, it could be argued that the all of the \$2.0 million GPR supported bonding should be retained to assist the Park in meeting its infrastructure demands. Under this alternative, the \$2.0 million GPR supported bonding authorized for the dormitory facility would be used to fund the repair and renovation of facilities at the Park, which would provide an additional \$755,500 GPR supported bonding (over the \$1,244,500 provided in the amendment) for such activities.

#### **Existing Program Revenue Bonding Authority**

9. State Fair Park Board has \$27.85 million PR supported bonding, to make improvements at State Fair Park and including the race track and Pettit National Ice Center of which approximately \$7.3 million remains available.

10. 1995 Act 27 provided \$8.55 million PR supported bonding for the following purposes: (a) \$5.0 million for the enclosure and renovation of the coliseum facility; (b) \$2.3 million for Park maintenance projects; and (c) \$1.25 million for improvements at the racetrack (the racetrack bonding has been released by the Building Commission).

11. The coliseum facility is currently used primarily during the summer months for horse and livestock shows. Park officials have indicated that enclosing the facility could allow the facility to be used for concerts, trade shows, home ice for a semi-professional hockey team or a practice facility for an arena football team.

12. No bonding has been released related to the project to renovate and enclose the coliseum facility. State Fair Park officials indicate that while the renovation and enclosure of the coliseum facility is still a project the Park is hoping to proceed with, it is unlikely that the project would be started during the 1997-99 biennium. While the coliseum appears adequate to serve its present purpose, Park officials indicate that enclosing the facility would allow for the hosting of events year-round in the coliseum which would increase the Park's ability to generate non-fair revenue.

13. When the bonding for the coliseum facility was authorized, the Legislature required that an independent analysis of the financial viability of the dormitory facility and the enclosure of the Park's coliseum facility be approved by the Building Commission prior to the release of the bonds for the facilities. A draft of an Ernst and Young study on the financial viability of the dormitory facility was submitted to the Building Commission in February, 1996, prior to the release of the bonding for the dormitory facility. However, to date, no study on the financial viability of enclosing the Coliseum facility has been submitted to the Commission.

14. The March, 1996, Legislative Audit Bureau report indicated that completion of the coliseum project, as envisioned by Park Board officials, would likely cost \$11.3 million, which is more than twice the amount of bonding that is currently authorized. Further, the audit indicated that the plans envisioned for the coliseum facility would expand State Fair Park beyond its traditional purpose and put the Park in competition with other multi-purpose event facilities.

15. At this time, it is doubtful that State Fair Park would make use of the \$5.0 million authorized for the coliseum renovation and enclosure project because: (a) the project appears to be only in the conceptual phase of planning; (b) it is unlikely that the \$5.0 million in bonding would be sufficient to cover the costs of the project; and (c) it is uncertain that the improved facility would generate the additional revenues needed to cover the debt service costs. Therefore, the Committee could consider deleting the project and bonding authorization from the 1995-97 state building program or provide that a portion of the bonding be used to cover the costs of the Park's 1997-99 building program request.

### **Race Track Contract**

16. The current contract with the promoter at State Fair's racetrack requires that the contractor make \$640,000 in improvements to the track facilities. The improvements may be made with state general obligation program revenue bonds provided the contractor makes additional rent payments to cover State Fair Park's debt service costs associated with the bonds. Approximately \$1.3 million in general obligation bonding has been used to fund improvements at the race track.

17. The March, 1996, Legislative Audit Bureau report indicated that State Fair Park officials had not verified the costs or that the installation of the improvements at the track have

been completed by the contractor as required by the contract. Further, the audit indicated that Park officials conduct only a limited review of the contractors accounting practices and financial information.

However, Park officials indicate that future projects containing general obligation bonding will be reviewed by DOA's Division of Facilities Development. Further, Park officials indicate that the audit's concerns related to review of annual financial information are being addressed.

18. The audit indicated that State Fair Park's revenues from racing events held at the Park have declined by 36.9% from 1990-91 through 1994-95. However, the audit also indicates that some of the decline in racing revenues appears to be related to the current contractor's buy-out of the previous contractor's racing contract. Further, the audit indicated that while State Fair Park officials believed that, over the long term, the current racing contract would benefit the Park financially, several of the current contract provisions favor the current contractor rather than the Park.

19. The current racing contract is due to expire in 1998, however the contractor can unilaterally extend the contract for up to three, seven-year terms if the contractor remains current on the payments required under the contract. If the contract is not renewed or if the contractor does not make payments sufficient to cover the debt service cost on the bonds used to fund improvements at the track (approximately \$270,000 annually associated with bonding under the Commission's recommendations), State Fair Park, or if the Park is unable, the State would be required to pay off the bonds.

20. State Fair Park indicated to the Building Commission that the additional bonding is needed for the race track facility because race sanctioning bodies such as CART and NASCAR have identified safety improvements (such as replacing the crashwall and infield lighting) and other track improvements (such as replacing sections of bleachers) that are necessary to ensure that existing races at the track will be able to continue and to increase the potential for additional races to be held at the Park.

21. However, it could be argued that the state should not provide additional bonding for the race track until the existing contract is renewed and State Fair Park receives a more favorable contract position.

## **ALTERNATIVES TO BASE**

**A.**

### **Dormitory Facility and Services to Park Buildings**

1. Approve the Building Commission's recommendations to delete \$755,500 in general fund supported bonding by: (a) deleting \$2.0 million GPR supported bonding associated with the construction of a dormitory facility at the Park; and (b) providing \$1,244,500 GPR

supported bonding to upgrade and replace main services (sewer, water, storm sewer and electrical services) to Park buildings.

Further, provide \$4,292,500 in self amortizing general obligation bonding as follows: (a) \$1,244,500 PR supported bonding to upgrade and replace main services to Park buildings; and (b) \$3,048,000 PR supported bonding for additional racetrack improvements at the Park.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>BR-GPR</u>	<u>BR-PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
<b>1997-99 FUNDING</b> (Change to Base)	-\$755,500	\$4,292,500	\$3,537,000
[Change to Bill]	-\$755,500	\$4,292,500	\$3,537,000]

2. Modify the Building Commission's recommendations as follows: (a) delete \$2.0 million GPR supported bonding associated with the construction of a dormitory facility at the Park; and (b) providing \$2.0 million GPR supported bonding to upgrade and replace main services (sewer, water, storm sewer and electrical services) to Park buildings.

Further, provide \$3,537,000 in self amortizing general obligation bonding as follows: (a) \$489,000 PR supported bonding to upgrade and replace main services to Park buildings; and (b) \$3,048,000 PR supported bonding for additional racetrack improvements at the Park.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>BR-PR</u>
<b>1997-99 FUNDING</b> (Change to Base)	\$3,537,000
[Change to Bill]	\$3,537,000

3. Maintain current law.

## **B. Enclosure and Renovation of the Coliseum Facility**

1. Delete the current law enumeration and \$5.0 million in program revenue supported borrowing associated with the renovation and enclosure of the coliseum facility at State Fair Park.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>BR-PR</u>
<b>1997-99 FUNDING</b> (Change to Base)	-\$5,000,000
[Change to Bill]	-\$5,000,000]

2. Maintain current law.

**C. Approval of Racing Contract**

1. Require that prior to the release of \$3,048,000 PR supported bonding for additional racetrack improvements by the Building Commission, the renewal of the racing contract would have to be reviewed and approved by the Joint Legislative Audit Committee.

2. Take no action.

Prepared by: Al Runde

MO#

A1# A2 B1 C2

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## **ISSUE**

### **Nash Automobile Museum (Building Program)**

[LFB Summary: Page 98.2 thru Page 98.4, #1, Page 98.8, #7]

## **BUILDING COMMISSION**

Enumerate the project in the 1997-99 state building program with \$1 million in general fund supported borrowing along with \$7 million in gifts and grants funding to construct an automobile museum. Provide \$1 million of general fund supported, general obligation bonding for this purpose.

Require the Building Commission, if it approves the Nash Auto Museum project (enumerated under the recommendation with \$1 million in general fund supported borrowing and \$7 million gifts, grants and other receipts funding) to authorize the bonding and make payments to the Kenosha Historical Society for the maintenance, storage and display of its collection of Nash automobiles and other historical materials. The Building Commission would be required to determine the total amount of payment, which would not be allowed to exceed the lesser the \$1 million in bonding enumerated in the building program or 12.5% of the total project cost. The Building Commission would not be allowed to make payments to the Kenosha Historical Society unless the DOA has reviewed and approved the plans for the project; however, DOA would be prohibited from supervising any services or work or contracting for the project. Further, the Governor or the DOA Secretary would not have to approve any contract for work on the project.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The current owner of the Nash automobiles is offering to donate the collection of automobiles to the Kenosha Historical Society for preservation and display. With the Nash automobiles having been manufactured in Kenosha, the proposed museum would display the automobiles as part of the city's and the state's automobile history.

2. The proposed \$8 million project, which would consist of two \$4 million structures, would be funded as follows: (a) \$1 million in state, general fund supported general obligation bonding; (b) \$3 million in donations from the City of Kenosha; (b) \$3 million in gifts, grants or other receipts funding; and (d) \$1 million in contributions from the Museum Board.

3. The state's \$1 million in general obligation bonding would provide the state with a 25% interest in the museum structure, which would be one of the two proposed structures. At this time, as indicated by Building Commission documents, the funding and staffing associated with the operation and maintenance of the facility would not require additional state funds, but rather would be the responsibility of the Kenosha Historical Society.

4. DOA staff indicate that at this time a limited amount of gifts and grants funds have been received for the project.

5. It could be argued that the providing state funds for projects such as the proposed Nash automobile museum could establish a precedent for such projects. That is, other local governmental units and nonprofit organizations with similar projects could request state general obligation borrowing to assist with the financing of their projects.

6. However, the current owner of the Nash automobile collection is not interested in maintaining the automobile collection. Therefore, if deleting the state's share of the project would not allow for the construction of the museum facility, the automobile collection would likely be sold off and divided among various owners. However, with the state's share being only one-eighth of the overall project cost, it could be argued that the project could be built in some fashion regardless of the state's funds.

## ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. <sup>FAIL</sup> Approve the Building Commission's recommendation to provide \$1 million in general fund supported borrowing along with \$7 million in gifts and grants funding to construct an automobile museum enumerated under other projects in the 1997-99 state building program. Provide that the Commission would be required to determine the total amount of payment, which could not exceed the lesser of \$1 million or 12.5% of the total project cost.

**Alternative 1****BR****1997-99 FUNDING** (Change to Base)

\$1,000,000

[Change to Bill]

\$1,000,000]

2. Take no action.

Default

Prepared by: Al Runde

MO#

A/H #1

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	<del>Y</del>	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A

BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
DECKER	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	Y	<del>N</del>	A
WINEKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	<del>Y</del>	N	A

AYE 6 NO 10 ABS



To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## **ISSUE**

### **Thompson Correctional Center Fence (Building Program/Corrections)**

[LFB Summary: Page 98.1, #1]

## **CURRENT LAW**

The Thompson Correctional Center in Deerfield is a minimum-security correctional center. The facility currently does not have a fence.

## **BUILDING COMMISSION**

Provide \$200,000 in general fund supported borrowing to install a perimeter fence at the Thompson Correctional Center.

## **DISCUSSION POINTS**

1. In connection with the Community Confinement and Control (CCC) pilot program, the Commission recommended the construction of a perimeter security fence around the Thompson Correctional Center in Deerfield. Under the CCC program, the Thompson Center was to serve as the confinement location for inmates sentenced to the program. On May 29, 1997, the Committee removed the CCC pilot program from Senate Bill 77.

2. Other than the Ellsworth Correctional Center in Union Grove, no other minimum-security correctional center has a perimeter fence. The correctional centers generally provide work release, education, treatment and/or job preparation programs for minimum-security inmates prior to release on parole.

3. Given that the CCC pilot program has been removed from the budget and that only one correctional center has a perimeter fence, funding for the perimeter fence at the Thompson Center should be removed from the amendment.

### MODIFICATION TO BASE

Remove \$200,000 in general fund supported borrowing for a perimeter fence at the Thompson Correctional Center and the enumeration of this project.

<u>Modification</u>	<u>BR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill	- \$200,000]

Prepared by: Jere Bauer

MO# Modification

2 JENSEN	X	N	A
OURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A
COGGS	Y	X	A
1 BURKE	X	N	A
DECKER	X	N	A
GEORGE	Y	X	A
JAUCH	X	N	A
WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

AYE 14 NO 2 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## **ISSUE**

### **Submission of the Capital Budget (Building Program)**

## **CURRENT LAW**

The statutes require that the Governor's biennial budget recommendations be submitted to the Legislature by the last Tuesday in January, unless an extension is granted by joint resolution of the Legislature.

There is no date by which the Building Commission is required to submit its recommendations regarding the state's biennial capital budget.

## **BUILDING COMMISSION**

No provision.

## **DISCUSSION POINTS**

1. Historically, the state's capital budget is submitted to the Joint Committee on Finance for inclusion in the biennial budget bill at some point after introduction of the Governor's biennial budget. The capital budget recommendations of the Building Commission are typically drafted and transmitted to the Finance Committee as an amendment to the biennial budget.

2. Upon submission of the capital budget, the Legislative Fiscal Bureau prepares a summary of the provisions of the capital budget and, following distribution of that document, the

Joint Committee on Finance conducts a briefing and public hearing on the Building Commission's recommendations. The Fiscal Bureau then prepares issue papers relating to the capital budget and the Committee meets in executive session to deliberate on the Commission's recommendations. The Finance Committee's recommendations are then incorporated into its version of the biennial budget.

3. The Division of Facilities Development (DFD) of the Department of Administration serves as staff to the Building Commission and is responsible for preparation of the capital budget. In January, 1996, DFD issued capital budget instructions to all agencies and required that agency requests be submitted to DFD by September 3, 1996. The September 3 date is approximately two weeks earlier than the required September 15 date for submittal of agency operating budget requests.

Similar to the Budget Office's role in preparing the Executive budget document for the Governor, DFD prepares its recommendations for the capital budget and presents them to the Building Commission. Following action by the Building Commission, the capital budget is then forwarded to the Legislature via the Joint Committee on Finance.

4. Because the Finance Committee generally attempts to complete its work on the budget at the end of May or early June, it is important that the capital budget be submitted in a timely fashion. In the past, this document has been generally submitted in mid-April. Recently, however, the date of submission has gone well beyond mid-April. The submission date of the capital budget to the Finance Committee over the past four biennia is shown below:

<u>Biennium</u>	<u>Date of Submission</u>
1991-93	April 25
1993-95	April 28
1995-97	May 8
1997-99	May 20*

\* Corrective amendment submitted May 23.

5. The Building Commission is composed of the Governor (Chair), six legislators and one public member (appointed by the Governor). The legislative members are not seated until the beginning of each session (January of the odd-numbered years) and thus, it is not reasonable to expect that the Commission could thoroughly review all requested projects, make decisions, draft their recommendations and submit them to the Legislature at the time of submittal of the biennial budget. However, delaying submittal of the building program until May (especially late-May) significantly reduces the time that the public and Legislature have to review and analyze the recommendations of the Commission.

6. To address this, a submittal date could be placed in the statutes. This is consistent with the requirements placed upon the Governor for submittal of the biennial budget. It would seem reasonable that the Commission complete its work and submit its recommendations and drafted language by the third Tuesday in April. Depending on the year, the third Tuesday in April would be between April 15 and April 21. If, for some reason, the Commission sought additional time, it could seek an extension by joint resolution of the Legislature.

### ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Require, by statute, the Building Commission to submit its recommendations and drafted language on the state's building program to the Joint Committee on Finance by the third Tuesday in April of the odd-numbered years.

2. Adopt Alternative 1 and provide that, if requested, an extension to that date could be granted by joint resolution of the Legislature.

3. Take no action. Thus, no date for submittal of the building program would be required.

MO# \_\_\_\_\_

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ ABS \_\_\_\_\_

*Del  
motion  
# 502*

# BUILDING PROGRAM

## Submission of Capital Budget (Paper #211)

### Motion:

Move to modify Alternative 1 in Legislative Fiscal Bureau paper #211 and require that the Building Commission submit its recommendations and drafted language on the state's building program to the Joint Committee on Finance by the first Tuesday in April of the odd-numbered years. Further, allow that an extension may be granted with approval of the Joint Committee on Finance.

MO# 5002

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### **Minor Policy and Technical Changes -- Adjustments to a Project Enumeration and Bonding Amounts (Building Program)**

[LFB Summary: Page 98.1, #1, Page 98.5, #2 and Page 98.7, #4]

## BUILDING COMMISSION

Enumerate the UW-Platteville Russell Hall Remodeling project with a project budget of \$7,927,000. Provide \$433,992,200 in 1997-99 and \$58,885,000 in 1999-2001 of new general obligation bonding authority.

## MODIFICATIONS TO BASE

1. Modify the 1995-97 building program to increase the project enumeration for the UW-Platteville Russell Hall remodeling project by \$630,000, rather than creating a new enumeration in the 1997-99 building program.

**Explanation:** The UW-Platteville Russell Hall Remodeling project was enumerated in 1995 Act 27 (the 1995-97 budget) with a project budget of \$7,297,000. The Commission is recommending that the project budget be increased by \$630,000. Usual practice when adjusting the enumeration for a project in a previous building program is to amend the previous building program, rather than creating a new enumeration and leaving the old enumeration still in effect.

2. Make minor adjustments to the bonding amounts in the recommended building program so that the bonding authorization amounts would add exactly to the total project enumerations funded from bonding.

**Explanation:** There are minor differences between the amount of bonding shown in the project enumerations and the total bonding authorized in the building program. This modification would allow LFB staff, in consultation with staff from the Division of Facilities Development in DOA, to make any needed adjustments.

Prepared by: Dave Loppnow

*in Paper 212  
213  
214  
215  
216*

MO# Modifications

2 JENSEN	X	N	A
OURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A
COGGS	Y	X	A

BURKE	X	N	A
DECKER	X	N	A
GEORGE	X	N	A
JAUCH	X	N	A
WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS



To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### Minor Policy and Technical Modifications -- Debt Service on UW-Madison Athletic Facilities Maintenance (Building Program)

[LFB Summary: Page 98.15, #23]

## BUILDING COMMISSION

Decrease the GPR share of debt service associated with maintenance of UW-Madison athletic facilities from 80% to 70% and make a corresponding increase in the program revenue share of debt service from 20% to 30%, effective July 1, 1998.

### MODIFICATION TO BASE

Require that the 70/30 debt service split apply only to UW-Madison athletic facilities maintenance projects that are authorized for construction by the Building Commission after July 1, 1998.

**Explanation:** Staff from DOA indicate that the amendment does not fully capture the intent of the Building Commission, which is that the 70/30 debt service split on maintenance of UW-Madison athletic facilities would be effective only on those maintenance projects approved by the Commission after July 1, 1998. As drafted, the share of debt service would change for all projects, effective July 1, 1998.

Prepared by: Al Runde

MO# \_\_\_\_\_

JENSEN Y N A  
OURADA Y N A  
HARSDORF Y N A  
ALBERS Y N A  
GARD Y N A  
KAUFERT Y N A  
LINTON Y N A  
COGGS Y N A

BURKE Y N A  
DECKER Y N A  
GEORGE Y N A  
JAUCH Y N A  
WINEKE Y N A  
SHIBILSKI Y N A  
COWLES Y N A  
PANZER Y N A

AYE \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ ABS \_\_\_\_\_ Page 1

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### **Minor Policy and Technical Modification - - Ethan Allen Gatehouse (Building Program)**

[LFB Summary: Page 98.2 thru Page 98.4, #1 (All Agency Projects)]

## CURRENT LAW

As part of the state building program, certain minor repair and renovation projects are not subject to the enumeration requirement. These broad types of projects are listed and are generally enumerated as "all agency" projects and are classified in several different categories: (a) facilities repair and renovation; (b) utilities repair and renovation; (c) health, safety and environment; (d) preventative maintenance; (e) capital equipment allocation; and (f) land and property acquisition.

## BUILDING COMMISSION

Provide \$990,000 in general fund supported general obligation bonding to construct a new gatehouse facility at the Ethan Allen School enumerated as a facilities renovation and repair -- all agency project.

## MODIFICATION TO BASE

As described, the project would involve the construction of a new gatehouse facility at Ethan Allen and the demolition of the existing facility. Therefore, the project should be enumerated under Department of Corrections facilities and a \$990,000 increase should be made to the Department of Corrections general fund supported borrowing authority with a

corresponding decrease in the Building Commission's other public purposes (all agency) bonding authority.

Prepared by: Al Runde

MO# \_\_\_\_\_

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ ABS \_\_\_\_\_

*See paper 212*

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### Excess General Obligation Bonding Authority (Building Program)

## CURRENT LAW

General obligation bonding that is authorized remains available for use indefinitely until it is issued by the Building Commission or repealed by the Legislature.

## BUILDING COMMISSION

No provision.

## MODIFICATION TO BASE

~~Decrease existing bonding authorized to refund debt issued by the old Building Corporations by \$746,600. Delete \$100,000 of bonding authorized to fund the transition from using the old Building Corporations for state capital finance to direct state bonding.~~

**Explanation:** This bonding authority was adjusted in 1995 Act 27. Through December 27, 1996, an additional \$746,600 was paid off. Further, \$100,000 of bonding relating to the change in the early 1970s to direct state bonding can be eliminated.

<u>Modification</u>	<u>BR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$846,600
[Change to Bill]	- \$846,600]

Prepared by: Dave Loppnow

MO# \_\_\_\_\_

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

*see paper 2/12*

AYE \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ ABS \_\_\_\_\_

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

**ISSUE****Debt Service Estimates (Building Program)****GOVERNOR**

Debt service is paid from agency sum sufficient appropriations established for this purpose. Senate Bill 77 provides \$289.1 million in 1997-98 and \$301.4 million in 1998-99 for estimated GPR debt service payments in the 1997-99 biennium.

**MODIFICATION TO BASE**

Reestimate the amount of GPR debt service required in the 1997-99 biennium by -\$1.5 million in 1997-98 and -\$3.5 million in 1998-99, which would be reflected as an increase in GPR-Lapse amounts in the general fund condition statement.

**Explanation:** The estimates incorporated in SB 77 represent a reasonable projection of required debt service payments based on the information available at the time that they were prepared. Since introduction of the budget, the Building Commission has approved the issuance of general obligation commercial paper notes as a means of reducing the state's cost of borrowing. Although there are a number of factors that would influence the amount of savings this initiative could generate compared to the SB 77 debt service estimates, \$5.0 million of savings over the 1997-99 biennium is projected.

<u>Modification</u>	<u>GPR-Lapse</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$5,000,000
[Change to Bill]	\$5,000,000]

Prepared by: Dave Loppnow

MO# \_\_\_\_\_

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

**Building Program (Paper #216)**

AYE \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ ABS \_\_\_\_\_

## BUILDING PROGRAM

## Contract Performance Bond Requirements

Item # 30

## Motion:

insert  
'state or' Move to establish the following criteria for performance bonds for prime contractors for local public works contracts:

- a. no bond would be required for local units of government projects under \$10,000;
- b. allow the state or a local unit of government authority to waive the bond requirement for projects between \$10,000 and \$25,000, if the following apply: (1) the state or local unit of government has developed written criteria as to what projects would require a bond to be submitted; (2) the state or local unit of government guarantees payment to any subcontractors on the project and all those who have claims for labor on the project.
- c. a bond would be required for local projects in excess of \$25,000; and
- d. bond requirements would not apply to the contract for the direct purchase of material by a local unit of government .

## Note:

Under current law, prime contractors on contracts exceeding \$2,500 with the state or \$500 for all other contracts for public works, including local projects, must provide a surety bond that guarantees the faithful performance of the work and that all subcontractors or other claimants are paid. Bonds submitted must carry a penalty of an amount that is not less than the amount of the contract.

MO#

5045

as Amended

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 10 NO 6 ABS

## BUILDING PROGRAM

Item #30

## Local Contract Performance Bond Requirements

## Motion:

Move to establish the following criteria for performance bonds for prime contractors for local public works contracts:

- a. no bond would be required for local units of government projects under \$10,000;
- b. allow the local unit of government authority to waive the bond requirement for projects between \$10,000 and \$50,000, if the following apply: (1) the local unit of government has developed written criteria as to what projects would require a bond to be submitted; (2) the local unit of government guarantees payment to any subcontractors on the project.
- c. a bond would be required for local projects in excess of \$50,000; and
- d. bond requirements would not apply to the contract for direct purchase of material by a local unit of government.

## Note:

Under current law, prime contractors on contracts exceeding \$2,500 with the state or \$500 for all other contracts for public works, including local projects, must provide a surety bond that guarantees the faithful performance of the work and that all subcontractors or other claimants are paid. Bonds submitted must carry a penalty of an amount that is not less than the amount of the contract.

MO# 3251

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 6 NO 10 ABS



## CORRECTIONS/BUILDING COMMISSION

## Prison Management

## Motion:

Move to require that the Department of Administration seek requests for proposals for the operation and management of a new medium-security prison constructed under the 1997-99 capital budget. Specify that the Department of Corrections and private prison management companies could present proposals for the operation and management of the new facility. Specify that the request for proposals would apply to the operation and management of a 1,000-bed facility, if the Building Commission authorizes one such facility, or to the operation and management of one 500-bed facility, if the Building Commission authorizes two 500-bed facilities.

## Note:

Under the 1997-99 capital budget, \$79,500,000 is provided for the construction of 1,000 medium-security prison beds, either as one, 1,000-bed facility or as two, 500-bed facilities. This motion would require that DOA seek requests for proposals for the management and operation of either a 1,000-bed facility or a 500-bed facility. The motion would allow private companies and the Department of Corrections to submit proposals.

MO#

3227

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

Motion #3227

 AYE 8 NO 8 ABS

BUILDING COMMISSION

Ashland State Office Building

Motion:

Move to direct the Building Commission to devise a plan to locate a state office building \*  
in Ashland which would deliver state services to the public.

\* other than a public rest area

MO# 5060

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
1 LINTON	<del>X</del>	N	A
2 COGGS	<del>X</del>	N	A

BURKE	<del>X</del>	N	A
DECKER	<del>X</del>	N	A
GEORGE	<del>X</del>	N	A
JAUCH	<del>X</del>	N	A
WINEKE	<del>X</del>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>X</del>	N	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	Y	<del>N</del>	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS     

Motion #5060

# NATURAL RESOURCES AND BUILDING PROGRAM

## Sandhill Wildlife Area Skills Center Dormitory

### Motion:

Move to enumerate a dormitory construction project at the Sandhill Wildlife Area Skills Center in Wood County as part of the 1997-99 building program and provide \$360,000 in segregated revenue supported (fish and wildlife account) general obligation bonding for the project. Direct DNR to utilize Wisconsin Conservation Corps crews to the greatest extent possible as part of this project.

### Note:

Funding for the project would be utilized as follows: (a) \$135,000 for barracks; (b) \$60,000 for septic and water; (c) \$52,000 for bathrooms; (d) \$40,000 for furniture; (e) \$2,500 for utilities; (f) \$2,000 for site work; and (g) \$68,500 for design, supervision and contingency. Debt service payments for the project would be approximately \$32,000 per year for 20 years. Initial payments will depend on the timing of actual construction. Assuming construction in 1998, estimated debt service would be \$32,000 SEG in 1998-99.

[Change to Base: \$360,000 BR and \$32,000 SEG]

[Change to Bill: \$360,000 BR and \$32,000 SEG]

#1597  
MO#

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

## BUILDING PROGRAM

## Waukesha State Office Building Expansion--45,000 Gross Square Feet

## Motion:

Move to enumerate an expansion of the Waukesha State Office Building at a project budget of \$4,800,000 of general obligation bonding.

## Note:

Based on information from DOA, accommodating all state agencies in Waukesha in an expansion to the state office building would require the construction of at least 45,000 gross square feet on the site. Under this motion, a project to expand the existing state office building by 45,000 gross square feet to house these state agencies would be enumerated, which would be funded by \$4.8 million in general obligation bonding. Annual debt service costs on these bonds would be an estimated \$400,000. Current rental payments are \$788,000 per year, although there would be operating costs associated with the addition to the state office building that would affect any cost comparison. In addition, these would be one-time costs relating to moving staff from the current rental space to the proposed addition. The current lease for DOT space runs through October, 2001; the length of time for other agency leases varies.

[Change to Base: \$4,800,000 BR]

[Change to Bill: \$4,800,000 BR]

MO# 5053

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A
DECKER	Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 13 NO 3 ABS

## BUILDING PROGRAM

### Capitol Restoration Project

#### Motion:

Move to enumerate a Capitol restoration project with \$10,660,000 of general fund supported bonding in the 1997-99 building program. Provide \$2,375,000 GPR of planning funds in 1997-98 for this purpose under miscellaneous appropriations in a new biennial appropriation. Specify that when these planning monies are reimbursed from project bonding, the reimbursement would be deposited in the general fund as GPR-Earned. Increase estimated GPR-Earned amounts by \$2,375,000 in 1998-99 attributable to these estimated reimbursements.

#### Note:

This motion would enumerate another portion of the Capitol restoration project with \$10.66 million of general obligation bonding. The project would include \$800,000 for South Wing audio/visual, historic fixtures and furnishings, \$8,725,000 for the central portion (Rotunda Project) and \$1,135,000 to initiate the East Wing Project. In addition, the motion would provide \$2,375,000 GPR in 1997-98 for planning, including \$1 million for a facility to house other agencies from the Capitol. The motion would specify that these monies would be deposited in the general fund, once bonds would be issued and bond proceeds would be available to reimburse these planning costs.

[Change to Base: \$2,375,00 GPR, \$2,375,000 GPR-Earned, \$10,600,000 BR]

[Change to Bill: \$2,375,00 GPR, \$2,375,000 GPR-Earned, \$10,600,000 BR]

MO# 5059

JENSEN	Y	N	A	BURKE	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A	DECKER	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A	GEORGE	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A	JAUCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A	WINEKE	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A	SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A	COWLES	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A	PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS

## BUILDING PROGRAM

## UW Centers

## Motion:

Move to require that the UW Centers (two year campuses) acquire movable equipment from general obligation bonding and not through DOA's master lease equipment acquisition program, unless the UW Centers request master lease financing.

MO# 5061

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
2 OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
1 ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

## BUILDING PROGRAM

### LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
8	Arlington Swine Research Facility
10	1995-97 Prison Expansion Enumeration
11	1993-95 State Laboratory of Hygiene Building Enumeration
12	Department of Transportation Minor Construction Projects
21	Digital (Fax) Signatures on Bids
24	DNR Facilities Bonding and Environmental Fund Debt Service Appropriation
25	Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection Debt Service Appropriation
26	Project Loans
27	Project Contingency Funding Reserve
28	Capital Equipment Acquisition Bonding
29	Statement of Building Program Continuation
30	Surety Bonds for Public Works Contracts

### LFB Summary Items for Introduction as Separate Legislation

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
31	Contractor and Subcontractor Prevailing Wage Affidavits
32	Definition of Practice of Architecture and Professional Engineering
33	Exemption of State Transmission Facilities from "One-Call" System

MO# Items #30

ZJENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS